



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,693	08/20/2003	Jeffrey L. Anderson	AAIR-1-1005	6718

7590 12/23/2003

Lawrence D. Graham, Esq.  
BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM PLLC  
816 Second Avenue  
Seattle, WA 98104

EXAMINER

LE, UYEN CHAU N

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2876

DATE MAILED: 12/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/644,693

Applicant(s)

ANDERSON, JEFFREY L.

Examiner

Uyen-Chau N. Le

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claims 3, 10, 12 and 20 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Re claim 3, line 1: Substitute "he" with -- the --.

Re claim 10, line 5: Delete "capable of".

Re claim 12, line 4: Delete "capable of".

Re claim 20, line 3: Delete "capable of".

Re claim 20, line 7: Substitute "the" with -- a --.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the

reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Manabe et al (US 6,594,547).

Re claims 1-4, Manabe et al discloses a method for checking a passenger and baggage into an airline flight, comprising: obtaining a boarding pass 9 at a first location, the boarding pass 9 containing information associated with the passenger P; and presenting the boarding pass 9 at a second location 4 adjacent a baggage drop conveyor to check the baggage in accordance with information obtained from the boarding pass 9; wherein the information contained on the boarding pass 9 is printed on the boarding pass in the form of a bar code 10b; the method further comprising scanning the boarding pass 9 at the second location 4 to retrieve the information; wherein the information comprises a destination and number of bags to be checked (col. 3, lines 1+).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manabe et al in view of Gannon (US 4,239,434). The teachings of Manabe et al have been discussed above.

Art Unit: 2876

Re claims 5-7, Manabe et al have been discussed above but fail to teach or fairly suggest that the second location further comprises a central conveyor and the baggage drop conveyor has a first end and a second end, wherein the first end of the baggage drop conveyor is adjacent the central conveyor, wherein the passenger placing the baggage on the baggage drop conveyor substantially at the second end of the baggage drop conveyor; wherein the baggage drop conveyor comprises a scale and the method further comprises the step of weighing the baggage with the scale.

Gannon teaches a baggage sorting system comprising a central conveyor 36 connected to a first end of a baggage drop conveyor 32, the passenger placing the baggage on a second end of the conveyor 32, which has a scale 12a for weighing the baggage (fig. 1; col. 4, lines 50+).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a conveyor system as taught by Gannon into the baggage checking system of Manabe et al in order to provide Manabe et al with a versatile system wherein the baggage can be sorted and delivered to a determined terminal/location without the required of labor, thus providing a time consumption system.

6. Claims 8-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manabe et al as modified by Gannon as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Barclay (US 6,158,658). The teachings of Manabe et al as modified by Gannon have been discussed above.

Re claims 8-19, Manabe et al/Gannon have been discussed above and further discloses a but fail to teach or fairly suggest that the first location comprises a remote computer located in a home or office; wherein the first location comprises an electronic kiosk.

Barclay teaches a system for matching passenger and baggage comprising plurality of remote computer connecting to the airport computer system 112 for reservation of airline ticket/boarding pass (col. 2, lines 60+).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Barclay into the teachings of Manabe et al/Gannon in order to provide Manabe et al/Gannon with a more versatile and universal system wherein the passenger can obtain/make a reservation for his/her travel/airline ticket at any time at any location, and thus reducing a delay time that caused by waiting long line at a ticket desk at the airport.

7. Claims 20-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pugliese III (US 6,044,353) in view of Barclay. The teachings of Barclay have been discussed above.

Re claims 20-26, Pugliese III discloses a system for checking a passenger and baggage into an airline flight, comprising: a server 230 coupled to a database containing stored passenger and flight information; and a baggage drop station located separate from the boarding pass station, the baggage drop station comprising (1) a central conveyor 17 having an origination end and a destination end and configured to convey baggage in a direction from the origination end toward the destination end, and (2) a plurality of baggage drop point conveyors 15 extending outward from the central conveyor 17, the drop point conveyors 15 having a first end adjacent the central conveyor and a second end distant from the central conveyor, the drop-point conveyors 15 further being configured to convey baggage from the second end toward the first end to be deposited onto the central conveyor 17; the system further comprising one or more sensors [120, 123] associated with the central conveyor and configured to detect the presence of

Art Unit: 2876

an item on a portion of the central conveyor; wherein the drop point conveyors comprise: an initial conveyor 25, the initial conveyor having an endless belt at least part of which defines an upper surface, the upper surface of the belt being configured to travel from a first end of the initial conveyor to a second end of the initial conveyor; and a staging conveyor, the staging conveyor 105 having an endless belt at least part of which defines an upper surface, wherein the initial conveyor is configured to deliver bags to the staging conveyor and the staging conveyor is configured to deliver bags to the central conveyor 17, and further wherein at least a portion of the upper surface of the initial conveyor is relatively lower than a the upper surface of the staging conveyor; a motor adapted to cause the staging conveyor endless belt to rotate; a sensor associated with the staging conveyor to detect the presence of an item on the staging conveyor; and a conveyor controller in signal communication with the motor, the staging conveyor sensor, and the one or more sensors associated with the central conveyor and configured to cause the staging conveyor to deposit bags onto the central conveyor only where there are no detected bags on the central conveyor (figs. 1-5; col. 6, lines 59+; col. 7, lines 6+; col. 8, line 66 through col. 10, line 45).

Pugliese III fails to teach or fairly suggest a plurality of electronic kiosks, each of the kiosks configured for communication with the server, the kiosks being capable of executing program instructions to request information from the passenger, retrieve flight and passenger information from the database, and cause an associated printer to print a boarding pass, wherein the boarding pass contains an indication of the passenger's name and number of bags to be checked.

Art Unit: 2876

Barclay teaches a system for matching passenger and baggage comprising plurality of remote computer connecting to the airport computer system 112 for reservation of airline ticket/boarding pass (col. 2, lines 60+).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Barclay into the teachings of Pugliese III in order to provide Pugliese III with a more versatile and universal system wherein the passenger can obtain/make a reservation for his/her travel/airline ticket at any time at any location, and thus reducing a delay time that caused by waiting long line at a ticket desk at the airport.

### *Conclusion*

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uyen-Chau N. Le whose telephone number is 703-306-5588. The examiner can normally be reached on SUN, M, W, F 7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MICHAEL G LEE can be reached on (703) 305-3503. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

*Uyen-Chau N. Le*  
December 15, 2003



**THIEN M. LE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**